

Appl. No. 10/707,560
Amdt. dated September 16, 2005
Reply to Office action of June 22, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Amendment to the specification:

5 The non-descriptive title has been adjusted as per your request. The original title "METHOD OF REPAIRING ELECTRODE PATTERN DEFECTS" is now more descriptively prosed as, "METHOD OF REPAIRING PIT DEFECT AND SALIENT DEFECT OF ELECTRODE PATTERN". No new matter is introduced.

10 **2. Rejection of claims 1-5, 7-13 and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Miyaji (US. 6,479,120):**

Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Specifically, the limitation "performing a first one-step repairing process with a conductive paste for repairing the electrode pattern defects" has been added to claim 1.
15 This limitation finds support in the specification in paragraph [0025] for instance, and no new matter is entered.

In accordance with the cited prior art US. 6,479,120, Miyaji discloses a method for repairing printed pattern defect. Referring to Fig.4, Miyaji
20 repairs the pattern defect by the following steps:

- 1) detecting defects and determining the positions of defects;
- 2) disposing a defect repair sheet 20 including a transparent sheet 22, a material layer for repair 24 and an adhesive layer 26;

Appl. No. 10/707,560
Amdt. dated September 16, 2005
Reply to Office action of June 22, 2005

3) using a transfer head 50 to transfer the material layer for repair 24 to the positions of defects; and

4) using a firing furnace (Fig.10) or laser irradiation (Fig.5B) to vaporize the adhesive layer 26 and therefore complete the repair of defects.

5

It can be seen that Miyaji discloses a **multi-step** method to repair defects. Specifically, Miyaji's method requires disposing the repair sheet 20 on the defects, *transferring the material layer for repair 24 into the defects with a transfer head 50*, and *heating the repair sheet 20 to vaporize the adhesive layer 26 by fire furnace or laser irradiation*. On the other hand, the method of claim 1 uses a one-step repairing process to repair defects. Specifically, the repair of defects is completed as long as the conductive paste is applied to the defects. In other words, the method of claim 1 does not require a transfer step and a thermal treatment to remove the adhesive layer. In such a manner, process step is reduced, so are process time and cost. Thus, the method of the present application is superior to and distinct from Miyaji's teaching. Claims 2-5 and 9 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable. Reconsideration of claims 1-5 and 9 is therefore respectfully requested.

20

Claims 7-8 further teach that the electrode pattern defect comprises a salient part, and a second repairing process used to remove the salient part by means of a laser beam. On the other hand, Miyaji fails to show that the defect may be a salient defect, and the laser irradiation in accordance with his teaching is used to vaporize the adhesive layer. Thus, Claims 7-8 are distinct from Miyaji's teaching, and should be allowed. Reconsideration of

Appl. No. 10/707,560
Amdt. dated September 16, 2005
Reply to Office action of June 22, 2005

claims 7-8 is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 10 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Specifically, the limitation "performing a second repairing process for removing the salient defect" has been added in claim 10. This limitation finds support in original claim 17 for instance, and no new matter is entered.

Claim 10 teaches using a second repairing process to remove the salient defect, which is a redundant portion of the electrode pattern. On the other hand, Miyaji only teaches repairing the defects that have recesses, and fails to teach or suggest any means to repair the salient defect. Accordingly, the laser irradiation in accordance with Miyaji is used to vaporize the adhesive layer. Obviously, the method of claim 10 is distinct from Miyaji's teaching, and should be allowed. Claims 11-13, 15-16 and 18-19 are dependent of claim 10, and should be allowed if claim 10 is found allowable. Claim 17 has been cancelled. Reconsideration of claim 10-13, 15-16 and 18-19 is therefore respectfully requested.

3. Rejection of claims 6 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyaji (US. 6,479,120):

Claims 6 and 14 are each dependent on claims 1 and 10, and thus should be allowed if claims 1 and 10 are found allowable. Reconsideration of claims 6 and 14 is politely requested.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be

Appl. No. 10/707,560
Amdt. dated September 16, 2005
Reply to Office action of June 22, 2005

issued in this case.

Sincerely yours,

5 Winston Hsu

Date: September 16, 2005

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

10 e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)